UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/549,367	09/14/2005	Nicolaas Lambert	NL03 0267 US1	6175

65913   7590   09/21/2009

NXP, B.V.
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & LICENSING
M/S41-SJ
1109 MCKAY DRIVE
SAN JOSE, CA 95131

EXAMINER
DOAN, DUC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2185	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/21/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.
10/549,367</td><td>Applicant(s)
LAMBERT ET AL.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner
DUC T. DOAN</td><td>Art Unit
2185</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 June 2009</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Claims 1-13 have been presented for examination in this application.

Claim 14 has been added.

Claims 1-14 remain pending.

Claims 1-14 are rejected.

Applicant's remarks and amendments filed 10/12/2008 have been considered

with the results that follow.

Specification Objections

The specification is objected to as follows,

A) The abstract of the disclosure is more than 150 words, See CFR 1.72 (b); In

addition the abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains legal

phraseology such as "said" and at line 17 it is not clear what "(r: quest profile)" means.

Examiner points out that the abstract should be a concise technical statement of want is

new in the art. This means that the abstract should stand alone in its ability to briefly

state the new art being disclosed since referring to other part of the disclosure prevents

a concise statement. Correction is required. See MPEP 608.01(b).

Appropriate correction is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate pars. of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by other's in this country or patented or

described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention

thereof by the applicant for a patent.

 (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a

foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year

prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under

section 122(b) by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by

another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent,

except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section

351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application

filed in the United States only if the international application designated the

United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English

language.

Claims 1-5,8-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being

anticipated by Biessener et al (US 2004/0088513).

As in claim 1, Biessener discloses a memory device (Fig 7 controller) comprising

a memory including a plurality of low-latency, rewritable, non-volatile memory cells (Fig

1 storage system 8, par. 44 memory volatile, non-volatile etc.., the memory has several

partitions, par. 52);

a profile storage unit including access information (Fig 2, partition table par. 56, and information related to a partition such as password etc.. par. 60);

an access control unit connected with said profile storage unit and said memory, (par. 60, controller 6 logic processes request, i.e claim's access control unit, requires connecting for accessing to information in storage and partition table 11); said access control unit configured to ascertain a request profile to an access request using request information of said access request (Fig 5, pars. 69-72, using request's information to clarify the specific section of partition table), said access control unit further configured to determine access rights of said access request in dependence on the access information allocated to the request profile of the access request (pars. 57-58, table 1, partition table information indicates access permission for requests).

As in claim 2, Biessener further discloses wherein said set of request information elements including discloses said request profile includes at least one set of request information elements (Fig 5, pars. 69-72, a request profile have related information), at least one request information element indicating at least one of: a type of request, an external memory client from which the request originates, a memory section the request is directed to, an access authorization, a password, a request protocol type, a time of request, an interface receiving the request, the length of the request, time span lapsed since a last request, a security class, or a priority class (Fig 2 and 5, partition table par. 56, 69-72, and information related to a partition such as password etc.. par. 60).

As in claim 3, Biessener further discloses a plurality of interfaces for communication with external memory clients and/or for communication according to

different memory uses, said interfaces being connected with said access control unit

and each of said interfaces being allocated to a set of request profiles (pars. 97, 100

allocating/maintaining set of information (i.e profiles) and different resources to a user,

such as drives files, partitions etc... It's noted different drives require different interfaces

for specific memory devices being used such as Flash, disk etc.. par. 94).

As in claim 4, Biessener further discloses wherein at least one of said interfaces

is implemented in the form of hardware (Fig 7 and 9, par. 94 discloses storage devices

of storage system 8 communicates with controller 6 using interface logic 18. It's further

noted that the interface logic 18 represents circuitries to send and receive data over

communicating medium 7).

As in claim 5, Biessener further discloses wherein at least one of said interfaces

is implemented in the form of software (Fig 7 and 9, par. 94 discloses storage devices of

storage system 8 communicates with controller 6 using interface logic 18. It's further

noted that the interface logic 18 represents drives logic (i.e software ad hardware), to

send and receive data over communicating medium 7).

As in claim 8, Biessener further discloses comprising a supervisor interface

adapted to create or change at least one request profile and/or access information

allocated thereto, given a predetermined condition (par. 15 an authorized user can have

a given/limit access condition to access partitions).

As in claim 9, Biessener further discloses wherein said supervisor interface is

adapted to admit or reject external requests for change of a request profile, depending

on access information allocated to at least one predetermined change request profile

(par. 18, filtering unauthorizing commands requests using configuration information defined by user/administrator).

As in claim 10, Biessener further discloses wherein said profile storage unit comprises a set of access flags, each access flag allocated to a respective request profile, and 20 wherein said access information is given by one of two possible states of an access flag (Table 1, partition states are flags that allow or reject requests for a partition).

As in claim 11, Biessener further discloses wherein said profile storage unit is integrated into said access control unit (par. 55).

As in claim 12, Biessener further discloses wherein said access control unit is adapted to maintain a current copy of said profile storage unit in a predetermined section of said memory (pars. 55-58, table 1, partition table information such as boot partition, is stored in a predetermined section of flash memory such that it can be loaded into the system).

As in claim 14, Biessener discloses a method comprising: receiving an access request to a memory, said access request including request information (Fig 4 and 5) ; determining a request profile using at least some of said request information (Fig 5, pars. 69-72, using request's information to clarify the specific section of partition table); determining access rights of said access request to said memory, said access rights based on access information allocated to said request profile (pars. 57-58, table 1, partition table information indicates access permission for requests).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-7, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biessener et al (US 2004/0088513) in view Jameson (US 2004/0054864).

As in claim 6, Biessener does not expressly disclose the SRAM-type interface. However, Jameson discloses an SRAM-type interface adapted to serve separate connections for address data input and user data exchange, respectively, between the memory device and at least one external memory client (Fig 1, a device capable of transferring to or from a memory NAND flash with SRAM-like interface, par. 25). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a device with interface conversion as suggested by Jameson in Biessener's system and thereby data can be transferred with an interface different than that of memory devices in an efficiently manner (par. 8).

As in claim 7, Biessener does not expressly disclose the claim's aspect of shared connection. However, Jameson discloses an I/O-type interface adapted to serve a

shared connection for address data input and user data exchange between the memory device and at least one external memory client (Fig 1 120 NAND flash interface that shares address and data, par. 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a device with interface conversion as suggested by Jameson in Biessener's system and thereby data can be transferred with an interface different than that of memory devices in an efficiently manner (par. 8).

As in claim 13, Biessener does not expressly disclose the claim's aspect of different ways of memory addressing. However, However, Jameson discloses a translation unit adapted to translate between one or more different ways of memory addressing (par. 38, translating between SRAM addressing way and NAND addressing way). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a device with interface conversion as suggested by Jameson in Biessener's system and thereby data can be transferred with an interface different than that of memory devices in an efficiently manner (par. 8).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments in response to the last office action has been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Examiner respectfully traverses Applicant's arguments for the following reasons:

A) Regarding Applicant's arguments at page 5 for the specification objection, Applicant have not addressed all the issues that have been requested in the previous office action dated 10/10/2008. Therefore Examiner maintains the objection as stated in the specification objection section above.

B) Regarding Applicant's arguments at pages 5-8 for the rejections of claims 1-5, 8-12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C 102(e), the arguments are not persuasive.

Applicant argues,

".. **Biessener does not disclose an access control unit configured to ascertain a request profile to an access request using request information of said access request. Biessener merely discloses a partition entry including a number of data fields** (Biessener, par. [0058]). Biessener does not disclose that the partition entry is ascertained to an access request. Rather, Biessener is simply concerned with providing hardware-level security on a partition-by-partition basis (Biessener, par. [0060]).

Furthermore, Biessener does not disclose determining access rights in dependence on the access information allocated to the request profile of the access request. Rather, Biessener discloses that controller 6 rejects all storage access commands directed to the secure partition (Biessener, par. [0060]). The access control of Biessener is different from access rights in dependence on the access information allocated to the request profile of the access request, **because Biessener controls access to the partition based on the state of the partition, not in dependence on access information allocated to the request profile of the access request.**

 For the reasons presented above, Biessener does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim because Biessener does not disclose a control unit configured to ascertain a request profile to an access request using request

information of said access request, said access control unit further configured to

determine access rights of said access request in dependence on the access

information allocated to the request profile of the access request. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 is not anticipated by Biessener

because Biessener does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim."

In response, Examiner disagrees. Biessener discloses access control logic

includes clarifying s request profile to an access request using request information of

said access request such as password, see Fig 5 pars 69-72.

Biessener further discloses determining the proper partition section (table 1,

paragraph 58) using the information in dependence on access information allocated to

the request profile of the access request (Fig 5, pars. 69-72, using request's information

to clarify the specific section of partition table).

C) Regarding Applicant's arguments at pages 5-8 for the rejections of claims 6-

7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) the arguments are not persuasive because the

arguments are similar to the arguments offered for claim 1 and the same responses

apply.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 36 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

When responding to the office action, Applicant is advised to provide the examiner with the paragraph numbers, and/or line numbers and page numbers in the application to assist examiner to locate the appropriate paragraphs.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc T. Doan whose telephone number is 571-272-4171. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 AM 05:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sanjiv Shah can be reached on 571-272-4098. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

/Stephen Elmore/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2185